UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,183	12/31/2003	David P. Marmaros	16113-1317001 / GP-178-00	5002

26192   7590   08/11/2008

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 July 2008*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-9,11,35 and 37-42* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 4-9, 11, 35, 37-42* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant has amended claims 1, 4-8, 11, 35, 37-41 and canceled claims

2, 3, 10, 12-34, 36 in the amendment filed on 7/29/2008. Claims 1, 4-9, 11, 35, 37-42

are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-9, 11, 35, 37-42 have

been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

3.   Claims 1 and 35 are objected to because of the following informalities: the

term "that snippet" should be written as "a snippet" to make claim clearer. Appropriate

correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 35, 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims fail to

place the invention squarely within one statutory class of invention. On paragraph 0008

of the instant specification, applicant has provided evidence that applicant intends the

"medium" to a network medium that can include signals. As such, the claim is drawn to

a form of energy. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore

this claim(s) is/are not statutory. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a

process. Energy is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or

manufacture. Energy is not a combination of substances and therefor not a composition

of matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.   Claim 42 recites the limitation "the search result document link" in page

5, line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 4, 35, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hennings et al (or hereinafter "Hennings") (US 6763496) in view of Cupps et al (or

hereinafter "Cupps") (US 5991739).

As to claim 1, Hennings teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving a search query from a client device" as receiving a search request

from a user device (col. 6, lines 19-21, fig. 6; col. 6, lines 10-30; col. 5, lines 15-25);

"generating at least one search result in response to the search query" as

displaying a homepage 100 as a result in response to a user request (fig. 2), "the

search result being associated with a search result document link to a search result

document, the search result including a plurality of snippets extracted from the search

result document" as homepage 100 associated text hyperlink anchors to another

webpage 118 as a search result document. For instance, clicking on either icon 104 or

text hyperlink anchor 112 will link the browser to Cruises page 118 (fig. 2, col.6, lines

47-55);

"generating an instruction corresponding to the search result, the instruction

being to a document browser to display the search result on the client device" as

clicking on either icon 104 or anchor 112 will link the browser to Cruises page 118

indicate the system generate an instruction corresponding to the homepage 100 (fig. 2,

col. 6, lines 47-55),

"to navigate directly to a portion of one of the snippets within the search result

document when the snippet is selected by a user" as homepage 100 is at the top level

of the content hierarchy, and there is a nested page for each of the travel categories

that can be reached by either clicking one of the picture icons or one of the associated

text hyperlink anchors. For instance, clicking on either icon 104 or text hyperlink anchor

112 will link the browser to Cruises page 118, causing the Cruises page to open in the

browser. The Cruises page, and the pages associated with the other travel categories

(e.g., Air Travel page, Trains page, etc., are all nested at a second level of the content

hierarchy. As with the homepage 100, Cruises page 118 also contains hyperlinks

pointing to pages that are nested below it, including Alaska hyperlink 120,Caribbean

hyperlink 122, Puerto Rico hyperlink 124, and Mexico hyperlink 126. Each of these

hyperlinks can be used to locate a page at a third level of the content hierarchy (fig. 2, col. 6, lines 47-60);

"and displaying at least a portion of the snippet; providing the search result to the client device" as displaying the homepage 100 to the user (fig. 2).

Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "to simultaneously display a plurality of frames in a frame set, each frame corresponding to a different corresponding one of the snippets ".

Cupps teaches displaying frames in a frame set at the same time, a first frame corresponds to each different restaurant or first frame corresponds to #21 Bistecca Di Halbut Alla Griglia (figs 8-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Cupps's teaching of displaying frames in a frame set at the same time, a first frame corresponds to each different restaurant or first frame corresponds to #21 Bistecca Di Halbut Alla Griglia to Henning's system in order to allow a client to narrow down search result following his or her desire so that searching a search result is performed quickly.

As to claims 4 and 37, Hennings teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the instruction includes an intra-document link for each snippet, each intra-document link pointing to the portion of the snippet within the search result document" as (col. 6, lines 51-67).

As to claim 35, Hennings teaches the claimed limitations:

"generating at least one search result in response to receiving a search query

from a client device, the search result being associated with a search result document

and including a plurality of snippets extracted from the search result document" as

displaying a homepage 100 as a result in response to a user request (fig. 2), homepage

100 associated text hyperlink anchors to another webpage 118 as a search result

document. For instance, clicking on either icon 104 or text hyperlink anchor 112 will link

the browser to Cruises page 118 (fig. 2, col.6, lines 47-55; col. 6, lines 10-30; col. 5,

lines 15-25);

" generating an instruction corresponding to the search result" as (fig. 2, col. 6,

lines 47-60; col. 6, lines 10-30);

"the instruction being to a document browser to display the search result on the

client device; displaying at least a portion of the snippet; to navigate directly to a

portion of one of the snippets within the search result document when that snippet is

selected by a user" as homepage 100 is at the top level of the content hierarchy, and

there is a nested page for each of the travel categories that can be reached by either

clicking one of the picture icons or one of the associated text hyperlink anchors. For

instance, clicking on either icon 104 or text hyperlink anchor 112 will link the browser

to Cruises page 118, causing the Cruises page to open in the browser. The Cruises

page, and the pages associated with the other travel categories (e.g., Air Travel

page, Trains page, etc., are all nested at a second level of the content hierarchy. As

with the homepage 100, Cruises page 118 also contains hyperlinks pointing to

pages that are nested below it, including Alaska hyperlink 120,Caribbean hyperlink

122, Puerto Rico hyperlink 124, and Mexico hyperlink 126. Each of these hyperlinks

can be used to locate a page at a third level of the content hierarchy (fig. 2, col. 6,

lines 47-60);

    "providing the search result to the client device" as (fig. 2).

    Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "to simultaneously

display a plurality of frames in a frame set, each frame corresponding to a different

corresponding one of the snippets".

    Cupps teaches displaying frames in a frame set at the same time, a first frame

corresponds to each different restaurant or first frame corresponds to #21 Bistecca Di

Halbut Alla Griglia (figs 8-10).

    It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Cupps's teaching of displaying frames in a frame set at

the same time, a first frame corresponds to each different restaurant or first frame

corresponds to #21 Bistecca Di Halbut Alla Griglia to Henning's system in order to allow

a client to narrow down search result following his or her desire so that searching a

search result is performed quickly.

9.   Claims 5-7 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Hennings in view of Cupps and further in view of Caronni et al (or hereinafter

"Caronni") (US 2003/0154221).

As to claim 5, Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein each intra-document link contains an artificial anchor undefined in the search result document".

Caronni teaches when lookup routine determines that an entry corresponding to the entity name does not exist, it checks the system view table for an alternate file system entry. For example, if the lookup routine expands the entity name with a first uncommon string and no corresponding entry is found, the lookup routine may subsequently expand the entity name with a second uncommon string. The link S:\eng\user123\file 1.txt contains user123 as an artificial anchor; thus, the lookup rountine expands the entity name with a second uncommon string for searching (fig. 4, paragraph [0030, 0037]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Caronni's teaching of when lookup routine determines that an entry corresponding to the entity name does not exist, it checks the system view table for an alternate file system entry. For example, if the lookup routine expands the entity name with a first uncommon string and no corresponding entry is found, the lookup routine may subsequently expand the entity name with a second uncommon string. The link S:\eng\user123\file 1.txt contains user123 as an artificial anchor; thus, the lookup rountine expands the entity name with a second uncommon string for searching to Hennings's system in order to allow processes to enforce different views dependent on the context that a process is in and retrieve information corresponding to the expanded sequence.

As to claim 6, Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein each artificial anchor includes a preassigned artificial anchor designator designating the anchor as artificial".

Caronni teaches when lookup routine determines that an entry corresponding to the entity name does not exist, it checks the system view table for an alternate file system entry. For example, if the lookup routine expands the entity name with a first uncommon string and no corresponding entry is found, the lookup routine may subsequently expand the entity name with a second uncommon string. The link S:\eng\user123\file 1.txt contains user123 as an artificial anchor; thus, the lookup rountine expands the entity name with a second uncommon string for searching. S:\eng\ is represented as artificial anchor designator (fig. 4, paragraph [0030, 0037]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Caronni's teaching of when lookup routine determines that an entry corresponding to the entity name does not exist, it checks the system view table for an alternate file system entry. For example, if the lookup routine expands the entity name with a first uncommon string and no corresponding entry is found, the lookup routine may subsequently expand the entity name with a second uncommon string. The link S:\eng\user123\file 1.txt contains user123 as an artificial anchor; thus, the lookup rountine expands the entity name with a second uncommon string for searching to Hennings's system in order to allow processes to enforce different views

dependent on the context that a process is in and retrieve information corresponding to the expanded sequence.

As to claim 7, Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein each artificial anchor includes the preassigned artificial anchor designator as one of a prefix and a suffix and wherein the preassigned artificial anchor designator includes a preassigned set of text characters".

Caronni teaches S:\eng\ as prefix. This prefix includes a set of character such as user123\file1.txt or user342\file1.txt . The S:\eng\ as anchor designator (fig. 4).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Caronni's teaching of \eng\ as prefix. This prefix includes a set of character such as user123\file1.txt or user342\file1.txt to Hennings's system in order to allow processes to enforce different views dependent on the context that a process is in and retrieve information corresponding to the expanded sequence.

Claim 38 is rejected under the same reason as discussed in claim 5.

Claim 39 is rejected under the same reason as discussed in claim 6.

Claim 40 is rejected under the same reason as discussed in claim 7.

10.   Claims 8-9 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hennings in view of Cupps and further in view of Hill et al (or hereinafter "Hill") (US 2004/0024788).

As to claim 8, Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein each intra-document link points to an anchor at the intra-document portion, the anchor being defined in the search result document".

Hill teaches Plant-Models List 20 gives a user a list of models of machines in the plant. Model 24 is a gateway that would list all of the units in the plant that are of the requested. The above information shows that the Plant-Model list 20 as a link to Model 24 as an anchor at the unit in the plant (paragraphs [0052, 0091]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hill's teaching to Henning's system in order to organize web pages of documents in hierarchy manner from a broad entity to a more specific entity so that a user can easily view modify a portion of a document easily and identify associations between documents within web pages.

As to claim 9, Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "determining whether the search result document link references an anchor defined in the search result document; and stripping the reference to the anchor from the search result document link if the search result document link references the anchor".

Hill teaches Plant-Models list page 20 contains a link back to parent Model page 24. It means that when a user want to back to parent Model page 24, the user select a link back in Plant-Model list page 20 and the system will strip the link to the parent Model page 24 as anchor (paragraph [0091]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hill's teaching of Plant-Models list page 20 contains a link back to parent Model page 24 to Henning's system in order to organize web pages of documents in hierarchy manner from a broad entity to a more specific entity so that a user can easily view modify a portion of a document easily and identify associations between documents within web pages.

As to claim 41, Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein each intra-document link points to an anchor defined in the search result document".

Hill teaches Plant-Models List 20 gives a user a list of models of machines in the plant. Model 24 is a gateway that would list all of the units in the plant that are of the requested. The above information shows that the Plant-Model list 20 as a link to Model 24 as an anchor at the unit in the plant (paragraphs [0052, 0091]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hill's teaching to Henning's system in order to organize web pages of documents in hierarchy manner from a broad entity to a more specific entity so that a user can easily view modify a portion of a document easily and identify associations between documents within web pages.

Claim 42 is rejected under the same reason as discussed in claim 9.

11.   Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hennings in view of Cupps and further in view of Shanny (US 20040158617).

        As to claim 11, Hennings teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the providing

the search result to the client device includes providing a search result page" as (fig. 2).

        Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the instruction

is at least one of a hidden tag and an attribute on a tag in the search result page".

        Shanny teaches hidden tag (paragraph [0041]).

        It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

invention was made to apply Shanny's teaching of hidden tag to Hennings's system in

order to allow transmission of all the input data as result data when instructions for

submit are made and further to detect page load abandons in real time.

12.   Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hennings in view of Cupps and further in view of Streble (US 6973492).

As to claim 11, Hennings teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the providing the

search result to the client device includes providing a search result page" as (fig. 2).

        Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the instruction

is at least one of a hidden tag and an attribute on a tag in the search result page".

        Streble teaches tag with a hidden attribute (col. 4, lines 56-60).

        It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

invention was made to apply Streble's teaching of tag with a hidden attribute to

Hennings's system in order to allow transmission of all the input data as result data

when instructions for submit are made and further to detect page load abandons in real

time.

Conclusion

13.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Tischer (US 7404142).

Contact Information

14.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571)

272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Firday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Cam Y Truong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162